

REMARKS

The applicants thank the examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted March 5, 2003.

To expedite prosecution, the applicants have amended claim 45, canceled claims 51, 53, and 69-93, and added new claims 94-98 corresponding to claims 62-65 and 67, which the examiner has indicated are allowable. The applicants reserve the right to further pursue the claims as previously pending in a continuation application.

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 45 as obvious over Dhenain in view of Lind, citing Lind as showing the recited joint.

There is no suggestion or motivation for the proposed combination. Furthermore, even if the references could be properly combined, which the applicants do not concede, the combination would not result in the applicants' claimed invention. Claim 45, as amended, recites "the inner member defining an opening for receiving the drive arm such that the drive arm is rotatable relative to the inner member about an axis of the drive arm." Lind does not describe or suggest such a configuration. Lind describes a driving disk 7 provided with "projections or arms 9 having spherical or cylindrical pins 10," and that the "spherical or cylindrical pins [are] secured to the latter [the driving disc] in well-known manner" (col. 2, lines 55-58 and col. 3, lines 46-50). Lind does not describe rotation of arm 9 about an axis of arm 9 relative to pin 10.

It is the applicants belief that this type of motion is necessary for the device of Lind to function; however, Lind apparently did not understand this. Lind describes sliding members 11, 11 "which are movable in relation to the pistons in a plane perpendicular to the axes of the pistons" (col. 1, lines 24-26), and "which on the sides engaging the pins have cup-shaped or channel-shaped recesses corresponding to the form of the pins for securing the necessary engaging surfaces between the pins and the sliding members" (col. 2, lines 59-65). Lind further describes that the arm 9 can have "an oblique position in relation to the motor shaft" (col. 3, lines 1-3) and that rather than having plane surfaces, sliding members 11, 11 can have "cylindrical or other prismatic surfaces" with "movability in peripheral direction to a certain extent between the pins 10 and the sliding members" (col. 3, lines 5-22). However, Lind does not describe or

suggest rotation of arm 9 about an axis of arm 9, but merely states that the spherical or cylindrical pins 10 are secured to the driving disc. With a spherical pin 10, pin 10 and arm 9 could rotate together about an axis of arm 9. With a cylindrical pin 10, if the pin were oriented in the plane of the figure of Lind, arm 9 could rotate with pin 10 about an axis of arm 9 but arm 9 could not have an oblique position in relation to the motor shaft. If the cylindrical pin 10 wherein oriented perpendicular to the plane of the figure of Lind, arm 9 could have an oblique position in relation to the motor shaft but arm 9 could not rotate with pin 10 about an axis of arm 9. Thus, Lind apparently did not understand the necessity of providing for rotation of arm 9 about an axis of arm 9 relative to pin 10 when pin 10 is cylindrical.

Therefore, the applicants submit that claim 45 and its dependent claims are patentable over Dhenain in view of Lind for at least the reasons discussed above.

The examiner has set forth reasons for rejecting dependent claims 55, 58, and 59. While not acquiescing to the reasons set forth by the examiner, the applicants submit that these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 45.